

Mary Levent
A CALM
G. Webb
DEFENCE⁸²⁷
OF THE
DEITY
OF
JESUS CHRIST.

IN REMARKS ON A
LETTER TO A DISSENTER
at *Exeter.* *K. R. S.*



L O N D O N :
Printed for JOHN CLARK, at the Bible
and Crown in the Poultry, near Cheap-
side, 1719.

Price Six Pence

A. C. ALM.

DEFEINCE

OF THE

DEITY

CHRIST



LETTER TO A DISSENTING

BY

JOHN GAY

AND

THE



A CALM
DEFENCE
Of the DEITY of
JESUS CHRIST.

SIR,



S you are not altogether unconcern'd in the Disturbance that has been in *Exeter*, about some novel Notions advanced and eagerly propagated there of late; so I cannot well deny my Remarks on a Letter, which I was led by you to the Perusal of, though a considerable time after its Publication.

(a) *THE Doctrine of the Trinity*, particularly the Deity of Christ which it attacks, is mentioned as a Matter of *abstruse* Speculation; and some-

(a) Letter p. 3.

times to serve a Turn, that the Errors about it may pass, and be diffused with less Observation, 'tis spoken of as not deserving *so much Zeal* and Animadversion, as not being Fundamental, or of so great Concernment to Christians, as the common and receiv'd Opinion makes it. Tho' yet the Author truly says (a) *That an honest Man and a good Christian can hardly satisfy his Conscience without making Inquiry into a Subject of such Moment and Importance as this.* And good Men have been wont to suppose, the Doctrine under debate not only to be clearly taught in the sacred Scriptures, but the Center and Support of revealed Religion, and that the most important Articles of Christian Belief have a necessary Dependence upon it; and to consider it as a particular Foundation of their Hope and Trust, as what runs thro' the Vitals of their Religion, regulates the whole of their Worship, and infers strongest Obligations unto Love, Gratitude, and Duty.

OUR Author (b) *wishes that the Gentlemen who acted with so much Zeal, had thought fit to use a little more Consideration.* What Consideration he himself used while he so freely blames the forward Zeal of others, we are left to guess, by his confessing, that a just and full Account had not been laid before him. And what Prejudice had it been to him, or the Cause he maintains, if he had suspended his Censure, and Insinuation, so much to the Disadvantage of those, whose Reasons and Defence he had not heard?

HE well observes, that (c) *Every Christian has an Interest at Stake, when the Controversy is about*

(a) Letter p. 4.

(b) Ibid. p. 3.

(c) Ibid. p. 4.

the supreme Object of Worship. All are, without doubt, concern'd to know whom they are to worship, and in what manner; and the *meanest Tradesman* hath as good a Right to search into matters that concern Salvation, as the *profoundest Philosopher*. Yet it is far from being necessary, that either the one, or the other, do fully understand, and be able distinctly to explain all that is to be believ'd concerning that same Object of Worship. We must conceive it to be a self-existent and eternal Being, and yet we are unable to comprehend and explain the Nature and Manner of Eternity and Self-Existence. Indeed it lies as a just Prejudice against the Scheme these Gentlemen appear so fond of, that in order to draw the Scriptures to give any tolerable Countenance to it, and divert the Proofs that are brought for the contrary, 'tis found necessary to employ all the Quirks of Wit, and Arts of Criticism, that Men of such Parts and Learning are Masters of; whereas the Scriptures are designed to instruct all sorts of Men, even of the meanest Capacities, in Things necessary to the pleasing of God, and the saving of their Souls. Nor does it give me a very favourable Opinion of *Arianism*, to find Mr. *Whiston* so little to rely upon Scripture Proof, as to labour with the Expence of much Pains and Learning, to bring in so many spurious, suspected, or adulterated Works of ignorant Antiquity to be receiv'd as inspired Writings, of equal Authority with the Holy Scriptures, especially considering how often Defect of Argument is supply'd by bold and precarious Conjecture; and what Advantage is hereby given to the Enemies of revealed Religion, who have taken Encouragement to treat the undoubted Oracles of Truth with Neglect and Contempt.

Our Author shews some concern, (a) *That a Doubt is made, whether Christians may hear or receive the Sacraments from Ministers, of the Soundness of whose Judgments in these Points they are not fully perswaded.* It will be acknowledg'd that there is a Difference between *not being fully perswaded*, where Sentiments are concealed, and having convincing Evidence, or plain and sufficient Grounds of Suspicion. People have without doubt a Right to be satisfy'd in the Ministers they statedly communicate with, or commit the Care of their Souls to, that they be sound in the Faith. And if perswaded in their Consciences that they shall be in danger of being drawn into Errors, which will greatly prejudice their Edification, if not hazard the undoing of their Souls, they may well desire to be excus'd from running such a needless Hazard, or having such a Ministry impos'd upon 'em, and think it their Duty to prefer such an One, as they can with more Safety and Comfort attend upon. Especially considering what an *Interest is at Stake, when the Controversy is about the supreme Object of Worship*; and when 'tis no less than the Crime of Idolatry that is justly feared, on the one side or on the other. And whence it comes to pass, (b) *That there is a Scruple only on one side of the Division,* I can't well comprehend, except it be to serve a present Design, to amuse the People by an artful Compliance, till the Party be formed and its Strength thought sufficient, at once to throw off the Disguise, and to crush such as shall think themselves oblig'd to stand in Defence of the Truth and the

(a) Letter p. 5.

(b) Ibid.

Purity of Worship, when they may in earnest, as seems to be threatned, (a) *find themselves affected with the Consequences.* What was the Spirit of the antient *Arians*, and what Outrages they committed against the Faith, is not unknown to such as are not altogether Strangers to Ecclesiastical History. One would hope to find the Modern in a better Temper and Disposition. However Persecution, or civil Penalties and Hardships on the Account of Religion, ought on all Sides to be utterly disclaim'd, and God's Empire over Conscience to be left untouch'd. But while we (b) *make a just Allowance for different Ways of thinking,* and forbear *to condemn one another,* it follows not that 'tis necessary or warrantable for me ordinarily to communicate with a Minister, whom I believe to be in a dangerous Error, by means of which my Acceptance with God, and eternal Interest are like to be prejudic'd. Nor can that be term'd or constru'd a Persecution, if I take the Course, that God and Reason direct, to provide for my Safety. He has given me a Power to choose for my self, and made it my Duty to guard against manifest Danger and Temptation, and use the best and most likely Means for my Edification; nor can I think it safe, much less my Duty, to live under the Ministry of a *Socinian* or Jesuit, when Providence affords me better Help and Means for Salvation.

(c) *THE like may be said in a great measure in reference to Prayer.* What reason can I have to confine my self to the Ministry of such as agree not with me in the same Object and Manner of

(a) *Letter p. 5.*

(b) *Ibid. p. 6.*

(c) *Ibid.*

Worship, when I am at Liberty to join in so solemn a Part of Worship as Prayer where my Mind may be easy and my Affections united? else I must be ever upon my guard, under continual Fear, Distrust and Distraction. Besides that there can be little Comfort or Satisfaction in Prayer, when my Minister addresses not to the Blessed Jesus, but as a Creature, or another Being than the supreme God, and I still consider and adore him as one with the Father. Now what (a) *Discretion* is in that *Worship*, which is manag'd with such disunited Minds, and distracted Affections? And how little ground for (b) *amazement*, if *Dissenters*, who make the *Scriptures* the only Rule of their *Worship*, should be uneasy with *Arian Ministers*, under the plausible Pretence that they may make use of *Scriptural*, tho' ambiguous Expressions?

NOR can I see reason for the artful Insinuation, that *Heats* and (c) *Outcries* are substituted in the place of manly Arguments and clear Proofs, when the just Danger of Errors that subvert the Faith, and tend to the Ruin of Souls, is represented. As we want not manly Arguments, which we are not ashamed to produce in Confirmation of the Truth; so we judge it not any Breach of Justice or Charity to call that by the Name of *Heresy*, which overthrows, and stands in opposition to a Truth of so great Moment and Importance.

WHAT is absolutely (d) *fundamental*, or *absolutely necessary to Salvation*, we need not be very forward to determine; nor what allowances a

(a) Letter p. 7.

(b) Ibid.

(c) Ibid. p. 8.

(d) Ibid. p. 8. 9.

gracious God may make for the different Circumstances, Education, and Prejudices of Men, who, while they use some honest Means for Information, fall into great Errors (yet how we can expect to be (a) *Sanctified*, and (b) *made free*, but by the Truth I know not); however this hinders not, but such Errors may have a fatal Tendency in themselves, and may greatly endanger the Souls of such as are entangled in 'em: Nor should we treat 'em as harmless things, tho' their deadly Effects should happen to be prevented by sovereign Goodness. 'Tis possible that a Man may have the Plague, and escape with his Life; yet 'twould be desperate Temerity and Presumption, needlessly, to run among the infected: We are not forward to pronounce damnatory Sentences, yet are willing to deliver our Souls, where are manifest Symptoms of Danger.

WE can't be easily drawn to believe, that a Difference in the great and main Articles of Christian Faith, is (c) *a meer Difference in Opinion*; and are not ignorant of the intemperate Heats and Passions, that have been on that Side of the Division, which our Author seems willing to excuse and screen, as (d) *under very great Provocations and Injury*; but this may be owing to Misrepresentation and the partial Accounts which were given him. And I would by no Means justify or plead for Injuries or Provocations on either Side. Truth needs none of these Managements or Supports; but is really wounded and injur'd by 'em. Tho' our Neighbours may have entertain'd dangerous Opinions, we censure 'em not presently,

(a) *John. xvii. 17.* (b) *Ibid. viii. 32.* (c) *Letter p. 9.* (d) *Ibid. p. 10.*

as Firebrands of Hell, but wou'd hope that the pernicious Influence and Effect upon their Hearts and Lives, may be mercifully intercepted, and the Prejudices, Mistakes and Failures they have been led into, may be pardon'd; yet think it not Wisdom to venture on a Precipice or Temptation, because 'tis not impossible to escape.

WHAT has been suggested about Fundamental Articles, may justly supersede further Alteration and Discourse; and it has been observed of what Moment in our Religion the Article under Debate is; far enough from being (e) *built upon obscure Hints, and doubtful Reasonings*, as is artfully pretended, when clear and pregnant Proofs have been so often offer'd, some of which are now to be brought under Consideration. And tho' we are perswaded, we have primitive Antiquity on our Side, and that the Doctrine we defend was esteem'd a main Article of Christian Faith, as well before as after the fourth Century; yet we care not to embarrass the Matter with that Dispute, but are content to appeal to the Holy Scriptures, and to have it decided thereby, supposing the Revelation made with sufficient Plainness. To come then to the Point.

HERE, with that great Master of Reason, Arch-Bp. Tillotson, I fix my Foot: (f) That there are three Differences in the Deity, which the Scripture speaks of by the Names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and every where speaks of them as we used to do of three distinct Persons. And therefore I see no reason why in this Argument, we should nicely abstain from using the

(e) Letter p. 10. (f) Works, Fol p. 589.

Word *Person*, nor can see any just Reason to quarrel at this Term.

AND why may we not apprehend, that in the one Godhead there may be Distinctions, which we do not clearly and fully understand, sufficient to found the Doctrine of a Trinity, and such distinct Predications as we find in the Scriptures? unless we presumptuously imagine, that we so distinctly know every thing that belongs to the Nature of God, as to be able readily to pronounce, what is possible to be in it, and what not.

WHAT is agreed to be a Divine Revelation, should certainly be treated with Respect and Awe, and not made, upon any Terms, to comply with our preconceived Notions. But we ought with Modesty and Reverence to inquire into the Mind of the most High, and humbly receive the Discovery he has condescended to make of himself and his Will, to regulate all our Sentiments, and form all our Schemes by that Revelation.

THAT there are numerous, and to Appearance, very plain Texts of Scripture, alleged for the Proof of Christ's Deity, cannot but be acknowledged, tho' the Sense of those Texts be disputed. It mayn't be amiss to take notice of some of them, which are wont to be produced, amidst the Multitude and Variety which Mr. Mayo and others have collected, and well put together. What shall we say, when we so often find him stiled GOD, and that without Restriction or Limitation? When the incommunicable Title of *Jehovah* is so frequently applied to him, as neither the One nor the Other appear to be unto a Creature for Dignity of Nature or Office?

(a) He is said to be possessed in the Lord in the beginning of his Way, before his Works of Old, set up from Everlasting, and (b) his goings forth were from Everlasting. (c) He is called the wonderful Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father. (d) This is the true God, and eternal Life. (e) God over all, blessed for ever. (f) Being in the Form of God, he thought it no Robbery to be equal with God. (g) He is the first and the last, that was, and is, and is to come, the Almighty. And says of himself, (h) I search the Reins, and Hearts. (i) As I live, saith the Lord, every Knee shall bow to me. (k) He is the Beginning (*ἡ ἀρχὴ*, the efficient Cause) of the Creation of God. Of him 'tis said, (l) Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever. That he is (m) the great God and Saviour. (n) God manifest in the Flesh. (o) God that redeemed the Church with his own Blood. (p) To him Glory is ascribed both now and for ever; (q) and that by the whole Creation in Conjunction with the Father upon the Throne; and no wonder, since he is (r) Lord and Heir of all Things; and (s) all the Angels are order'd to worship him; (t) with what Solemnity did they do it, when *Isaiah* saw his Glory and spake of him? (u) By him *all* Things were created and for him. Nor is it of small Consideration that we are (w) vowed to him in the great Solemnity of Baptism, as unto the Fa-

(a) *Pro.* viii. 22, 23. (b) *Mic.* v. 2. (c) *Isa.* ix. 6. (d) *1 John* v. 20. (e) *Rom.* ix. 5. (f) *Phil.* ii. 6. (g) *Rev.* i. 8. 11. (h) *Rev.* iii. 23. (i) *Rom.* xiv. 11. (k) *Rev.* iii. 14. (l) *Heb.* i. 8. (m) *Tit.* ii. 13. (n) *1 Tim.* iii. 16. (o) *Acts* xx. 28. (p) *2 Pet.* iii. 18. (q) *Rev.* v. 13. (r) *Heb.* i. 2. *Col.* i. 15. (s) *Heb.* i. 6. (t) *Isa.* vi. 3. *John* xii. 41. (u) *Col.* i. 16. (w) *Matt.* xxviii. 19.

ther; and are required to (a) honour him even as we honour the Father.

How can we now forbear concluding from these (and so many other plain Texts of Scripture, that might be mention'd), that Deity in a proper Sense belongs to the Son of God, considering, what with Men of Sense must be of great Weight, the manifest Design of this Revelation, to bring laps'd and degenerate Mankind to the true Knowledge of God, and their Duty; to abolish the Superstitious Errors and Idolatries that had obtained in the World; to lead unto real Holiness, to an acceptable serving and glorifying God, and to eternal Salvation?

It seems wonderful, if no such Thing was intended, that so little Caution is used to prevent the fatal Mistake, when it had been so very easy to obviate the Danger, and keep Wise and good Men from running into Idolatry and Perdition, who have made the most serious and impartial Inquiries, in order to the right Managing their Practice and Worship, and the establishing their Hopes for Eternity.

CAN this be thought congruous to the Wisdom and Goodness of God, who is so jealous of his Honour, and such a lover of Souls; when in a Manner the whole Christian Church, thro' a Course of so many Ages, has settled in a Perswasion and Practice, so injurious and derogatory to his Glory, and of such inevitable Danger? When the Reformed Churches, under the Conduct of Men of extraordinary Piety and Learning, and mighty in the Scriptures, which they made so much their Study (as the professed Rule of their Faith, Manners and

(*) John v. 23.

Worship) settled in the same Belief, unable to espy and escape the fatal Delusion?

NOR can it be deny'd, that vital Religion has eminently flourish'd, and innumerable Souls, that ardently loved God, and hated Idolatry, liv'd to his Praise and dy'd with Triumph, under the Influence of that Belief. Poor unhappy Souls! If all their hope and rejoicing in Christ Jesus as their Saviour and their God, was but Delusion and Mistake, and their Faith but an Affront to that God, whose Glory was dearer to them than their Lives.

THE Scriptures were manifestly intended for the Use and Salvation of all Ranks of Men, and in necessary Things accommodated to ordinary Capacities. Now how plainly does it seem there to be taught, that Christ is God in the true and known Sense? Or how cou'd the Doctrine of his Deity be deliver'd in plainer Words? Wherefore to fasten another Meaning upon them, and to wrest them to their Purpose, both *Arians* and *Socinians* are forced to use a great deal of Artifice, to torture them with all the Tricks and Engines of Criticism; to search whether a Word or Phrase that is used, can be found elsewhere to signify another Thing, and so by any means be turned to another Sense. By such a method of Interpretation, and the help of Wit and Allegory, it will not be difficult for Men of subtile Heads and lively Fancies, to explain away almost any point of Divinity, or give another turn to any Article of Faith. But surely the Oracles of God, that are of highest Authority, that treat about everlasting Concerns, that will be the Rule of the last Judgment, should be consulted with more Reverence and Humility; nor wou'd it be
less

less than Rudeness, so to treat the Laws of Men, or even the Writings of any Man of Sense.

BUT the grand Objection against the received Doctrine of Christ's Divinity is, That *it is unintelligible, and carries Absurdity in it.* In answer to which I wou'd observe two Things.

I. THAT the Existence or Being of a Thing, may be certain and uncontested, and we may be perswaded of it upon the clearest Grounds when yet we cannot comprehend it, or give a satisfactory Account of it to our own Minds. Who can tell us how the Parts of Matter are cemented, and hang together so firmly; and yet we doubt not of the Thing? Nay, we know not the Manner of the Operation of our own Souls, how Ideas arise and are formed in our Minds, or how our Wills act with Freedom and Liberty; which yet we feel in our selves, and are intimately assured of. Reason does oblige us to believe, that God is of himself, without any Cause of his Being; that he has been from Eternity without any Beginning; and that he has a certain Prescience of future Contingencies: Yet these Things are as inconceivable to us, as the Doctrine under Debate, and we are utterly at a loss when we come to account for them. There is neither Contradiction nor Absurdity in supposing, that the Divine Nature contains what is unintelligible to us, or what we do not fully comprehend; nor is it impossible that there should be in it, what may be a sufficient Ground for such Distinctions as the Scriptures mention. And what greater Absurdity is it, to suppose, that God may for just and weighty Reasons, secure of his own Greatness, unite humane Nature to himself; than that there may be an intimate and
vital

vital Union between a rational Spirit and a human Body, which we are assur'd of, and is the Matter of our own Experience, tho' we know nothing of the Manner of it.

2. ARE there no greater Difficulties or Appearances of Absurdity on the other side? What! no Absurdity in the Notion of a supreme and inferior, a greater and a lesser God? No Difficulty in admitting two Gods, a thing so abhorrent to Reason, and so contrary to express Revelation, whereby we are caution'd and commanded not to have any more Gods but one? No Difficulty in believing a Creature to be the Creator, or an immediate Instrument in Creating the World? Yet this so much shockt the Understandings of some of the Ancients, tainted with these Opinions, as forced 'em upon a precarious Fancy, without the least Foundation in Scripture, that God first created the Word, and then created Matter, which he formed into the various Orders of Being; but out of what *Matter* he formed the Angels and Souls of Men I find not. Is there no Absurdity in setting up another Object of Worship both for Angels and Men, to whose Service and Glory we must be all devoted, besides the Supreme God? and that upon such terms as seem to countenance and excuse the Pretences both of Papists and Pagans in their Idolatries? Is there no Difficulty in supposing, contrary to the constant Tenour, and plainest Declaration of the Scriptures, that the great Mediator, is neither true God, nor true Man? Or can we imagine that there can be a true Man without a Rational Soul? or that no more is intended hereby, but a Human Body animated by a mere Sensitive Soul, which how it is differenced from a Brute in Human Shape, will not be easy to determine?

BUT

BUT I pass from these Considerations to examine what our Author offers in Opposition to the Common Faith; and what he urges in Defence of his own. And here I shall be content to follow in the Method he hath seen fit to take. Tho' I can't but observe, that there is a great Difference between the conjunct Force and Evidence of many Texts of Scripture together, which mutually enlighten and support one another in the Testimony they give to an important Truth, and the Evidence of some simple Passages arbitrarily selected, and separately considered, if not sifted and artfully manag'd to cast a favourable Aspect upon a darling Opinion.

I. THAT (a) which he first mentions as a grand Argument for the Doctrine we maintain is 1 John v. 7. Tho' for what Reason this is set in the Front, and made so grand an Argument, can't escape Remark by such as know, that no extraordinary Stress is laid upon it, tho' it will not be easily parted with. 'Tis represented indeed as if (b) it was past all Controversy (no unusual Trick of Confidence and Boasting with these Gentlemen) that it belongs not to the Sacred Text; yet the Author can't but know, how much has been alleged, by Men of great Judgment Sincerity and Learning in Defence of it. Not only Gerhard, and the Famous Dr. Hammond, among many others; but Dr. Mills, and Monsieur Martin of late, after the most careful Researches, have given the World sufficient Satisfaction upon this Subject. That Cyprian and Tertullian quoted this Passage, long before the Arian Controversy arose,

(a) Letter p. 8. (b) Ibid.

is well known, and a manifest Proof of its being antiently read, and that it was not inserted in Opposition to the *Arians*, as some of that Way have fondly suggested. Whether the Preface to the seven Canonical Epistles were *Jerom's* or no (which yet *Mr. Martin* maintains) which testifies that the *Greek* Manuscripts then had it, and charges the *Latin* Interpreters with unfaithfulness in leaving it out; it is certain that it is very Ancient, and that as *Jerom's* Version has it, he protests that he had faithfully followed the *Greek* (*N. T. græcæ fidei reddidi*). Nor is it of small Consideration and Weight that such a numerous Council of Bishops, assembled at *Carthage*, Anno 484. in their Confession of Faith, prepared to be presented to *Huneric* that cruel *Arian* Persecutor, insisted on this Passage of *St. John*, when summoned to defend by the Scriptures the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, in a public Dispute with the *Arian* Bishops, who might then have so easily confuted the Quotation, if it had been false or forged. However it came to be omitted in many Copies of old, (as there are many other remarkable Omissions even in the *Alexandrian* Manuscript as well as this) whether by the Negligence of Transcribers, or the Fraud of Hereticks, who, (a) as *Socrates* observes, particularly depraved this Epistle of *St. John*, in order to separate Christ's Humanity from his Divinity, one thing is worthy of Notice, that the Antient Church never cast upon it any Suspicion of Forgery, but wherever it appear'd, it has been looked upon as the genuine Writing of *St. John*.

(a) *Hist. Eccl. lib. 7. ch. 32.*

The Context also seems to make *ver. 7.* necessary as conjoin'd to *ver. 8.* by *And* in the beginning of it; and as *Three that bear witness on Earth* stand in opposition to *Three that bear witness in Heaven,* called the *Testimony of God,* *ver. 9.*

AND this leads to consider the Sense of the *Words upon Supposition that they are the genuine Writing of St. John as our Author speaks.* It is not disputed whether [*these Three are One*] does signify their Consent and Agreement in Design, and the Testimony they give, or whether [*ὅτι εἰς*] is not to be interpreted according to the Subject, Matter, and Circumstances of the Place where the Phrase occurs, as *1 Cor. iii. 8.* *he that planteth and he that watereth are one* i. e. in Consent and Design: But in this Place something more seems plainly to be imply'd, and that the *Three that bear Witness in Heaven,* do not only agree in their Testimony, but are *One* in a more appropriate and particular Sense, intimating and denoting the Ground and peculiar Reason or Cause of their so agreeing, and that they cannot but concur in their Testimony. And therefore it was reasonable, when he came to the other *Three*, of whom it cou'd not be affirm'd that they were one in Nature, to affirm as much as the Matter would bear, that they are [*ὅτι τὸ εἶναι*] Testifiers to the same Purpose, tho' not [*ὅτι*] *One* in Nature. Now if no more were intended by their being *One*, *v. 7.* than their agreeing in *One*, *v. 8.* How easy had it been to have avoided the Ambiguity that was so like to lead into a dangerous Mistake, when there was no Necessity or just Occasion, to change the Phrase? And that we fix upon the true Meaning, appears more probable from what follows, *ver. 9.* where the Testimony given

by the Three in Heaven, emphatically said to be *one*, is called the Witness of God, which is greater and deserves the highest Regard.

FURTHER to clear the Apostle's Meaning, we may consider with the Author, the Words of Christ, *John x. 30. I and my Father are One.* And if they manifestly signify quite another kind of Oneness, than mere agreeing in Design, there is good Reason to interpret this, as con-noting such a like Oneness. Whereas he refers us to *John xvii. 11. Holy Father keep thro' thy own Name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, [one's] as we are;* and adds, *Are we to think, that our Saviour desir'd his Disciples should be kept to be one Being?* I answer, no more than when Christ said *Matt. v. 48. Be ye perfect, as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect,* he required that his Disciples should equal God in his infinite Perfections. [*as we are*, as] can denote here, as in many other Places, but a Similitude or Resemblance, not the same perfect Union. So *ver. 21. That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee.* There is not such an Union among Believers, as to be mutually in each other, and yet they are not only one in Affection and Design; but are all animated and acted by the same Spirit, *or by one Spirit are all Baptized into one Body,* so as all to be under the vital Influence, Operation and Conduct of that one Spirit, and to be brought to a more perfect Unity in Glory, the Thing Christ prays for; and herein more fully to resemble and answer the Union between the Father and Christ; this being possibly the nearest Resemblance and Similitude of it among Creatures. This hinders not therefore, but seems rather to imply, that Christ's Oneness with the Father, is of

of an higher Kind, and more exalted Nature, than the Oneness among Christians; and where- as it necessarily infers an absolute and most perfect Agreement in Will and Affection, Christians should labour, as far as they can, under the Guidance of the one Spirit of Christ, that unites them in one mystical Body, to immitate that glorious Pattern. Now that Christ is one with the Father in a peculiar and more distinguish'd Sense appears further by comparing *John* x. 38. *John* xiv. 11. *Believe the Works, that ye may know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.* Thus the Learned *Dr. Whitby* observes upon the Words, [That it appears that Christ speaks not of an Unity of Will and Concord only, 1) From the reason assign'd of the Security of the Sheep, the want of Power in any one, to snatch them out of the Hand of Christ, being one in Power with the Father. For the Foundation of this Argument is not, that the Father's Will, but that his Power was above all. 2) From the Inference of the *Jews*, that by these Words he made himself God, and so was guilty of Blasphemy. Now this invidious Charge Christ does not evade by saying, he only conspir'd with the Will of God, as all true Prophets did, but by appealing to the Works, which, says he, I do by the Power of the Father residing in Me, which plainly carries this to an Unity of Power, not of Will only. And then the Inference of *St. Chrysostom* is undeniable, [*οὐ γὰρ ἡ δύναμις αὐτῆς, ἐνδύλον ἐπὶ τῆς ἐσσίας*] and if the Power be the same, the Essence must be so.]

2. (a) The second Argument to prove the Divinity of Christ he sees fit to mention, *is, That he,*

is expressly called God in several Places of the Scripture. Which he thinks he can easily elude by two Observations. 1) (a) *That the Term God is sometimes applyed either to Idols, under Pretence of something belonging to them, which really does not, or to Creatures upon the Account of a Character, which they rightfully pretend to, and bear without blame.* 2) *That the Scriptures evidently lead us, to distinguish Christ's Godhead from that of his Father.* I shall readily attend him in each of his Remarks. And he is not ignorant that we agree with him in the former, that as Idols were esteem'd Gods by their mistaken Worshippers, and the Devil himself was taken for a God by Usurpation and horrible Errors, both Angels and Magistrates by special Dignity, and Authority intrusted with them, have in an improper and figurative Sense been stiled Gods. Yet such as read the Scriptures with Care, and unprejudiced Minds, must needs observe that the Name and Characters of Divinity are every where ascribed and challenged, in quite another Manner, and utterly in another Sense to the blessed Jesus, than to Angels or Governours, or any mere Creatures.

WE do not only urge that the Name and Title of God is frequently given to him, which in but a few Instances is given to Creatures, but that 'tis given without any Limitation, or any Circumstances that should determine to a figurative Sense. When 'tis said, *Let all the Gods worship him. I have made thee a God to Pharaoh. I have said ye are Gods, but ye shall die like Men.* No Body is at a Loss as to the Meaning of these Expressions;

(a) Letter p. 22.

or in Danger of being led into the Opinion, that the most High God is intended, or of worshipping the Creature instead of the Creator. But when we find that Christ Jesus doth so indifferently assume, and hath so often given him the Title of Lord *Jehovah*, and yet 'tis said, *Psal. lxxxiii. 18. That Men may know that thou whose Name alone is Jehovah, art the most High.* When he is called *the true God, the great God; the God over all blessed for ever;* and that the Name and Characters, the Attributes and Worship of the supreme God are without Scruple or Restriction often apply'd to him; what inevitable Danger of Mistake and Idolatry, if all this should signify no more than that as a Creature, or being of great derived Excellency and delegated Power, he may be in some improper Sense called a God? (a) Dr. *Whitby* well observes, nothing is absolutely in the Scripture, and in the singular Number, called God for any other Reason, than that the Divine Nature is imparted to it.

'Tis therefore his second Remark which we are to consider, and to be well assured that the Scriptures distinguish Christ's Godhead from that of his Father, so as to satisfy that there is an uncontestable and utter Distance or Difference between the one and the other. But I must confess my self at a Loss where to find it. Our Author produces two Texts for it. The first *Jo. i. 1, 2.* where it is said, *the Word was in the Beginning with God.* Now adds he, (b) *Was God the Word the same with him, with whom he was?* And why may he not be the same in one respect and yet differ in another, and *The Word was with God, and the Word was God, ver. 1.*? Why, according to the common

(a) Fol. vol. 1. pag. 447.

(b) Letter p. 24.

Doctrine, may we not suppose that he was the same in Nature and essential Perfections, tho' distinct in Person; or, that his Godhead was the same with that of his Father tho' he was in some Sense different from him, who in order of Substance, and in Way of Distinction, bears the Name of God and the Father?

THE other Text to prove that Christ's Godhead differs from that of his Father is, *Heb. 1. 8.* quoted from *Psal. 45. 7.* *Thy Throne O God is for ever and ever. ver. 9. Thou hast loved Righteousness and hated Iniquity, therefore God even thy God hath anointed thee with the Oyl of Gladness above thy Fellows.* Now says he, (a) Can he be the supreme God, who has one to be a God to him, and to bestow a Reward upon him? As if Christ was not be consider'd as a complex Subject, of whom some Things are evidently spoken with Reference to his divine Person, others with respect to his human Nature, and others that directly concern his Office as Mediator. And no wonder, if these are not unusually intermixt; if even in the same Place, as there is occasion, some Things are ascrib'd to him under one Consideration and Character, and some under another. Thus here it may be intimated that he has a Throne and Dominion, as God by Nature, which is for ever and ever, different from his mediatorial Kingdom, and that delegated Power which he is shortly to resign. And can it seem strange to any if our Lord Jesus, in another Capacity, and under a different Character, be the Subject of other or different Predications; if while as God, his eternal Dominion be acknowledged, as Mediator in our Nature, he be capable of Reward, and be anointed with Joy above his Fellows?

(a) Letter p. 25.

3. As to the third Argument from *Rom. ix. 5.* *Who is over all God blessed for ever*, his Ingenuity is to be acknowledged, in that he frankly allows this to be spoken of Christ, as *Socinus* also does, aware how contrary to the apparent Sense, and the Rules of true Criticism; 'tis otherwise interpreted by Mr. *Whiston*, and others, who perceiving the proper Characters of Deity express'd, would fain have it to be spoken of the Father by Way of Doxology. But our Author's slightly passing it over with the Observation, (a) *that he must be excepted who did put all Things under him*, will not be so easily admitted as a sufficient Reply to so pregnant a Text by others, whatever shift he may make to satisfy his own Reason and Conscience with it. Tho' Mr. *Whiston* also attempts to evade the Force of it (if suppos'd to be spoken of Christ) after the same Manner; (b) yet he suggests, that the Epithet *blessed* is always appropriated in Scripture to the supreme God, and almost always in Antiquity also, according to th Language of the *Jewish Nation*; and that the Phrase, *God over all*, is both in Scripture, and Antiquity, singly and directly apply'd to him. And whereas *God blessed*, or *blessed for evermore*, is observed scarce to occur above four times in the New Testament, and still manifestly denotes the most high God, and apply'd to him, *Rom. i. 25.* as distinguished from all Creatures whatsoever; how can we but acknowledge the Force of the Argument, and conclude from these exalted and distinguishing Titles so freely given to Jesus Christ, that he is God in the proper Sense, and one with the Father, these being not personal Properties, but Characters belonging to the Nature of God? Thus (a) Dr. *Whitby* says, from the Beginning,

(a) *Letter p. 25.* (a) *Prim. Epi b. p. 6. 7.* (c) *Fol. vol. 2. p. 53.*

these Words have been used by the Fathers as an Argument of Christ's Divinity ; and *Theophylact* $\kappa\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \chi\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \text{Ἀριε}\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\ \tau\tilde{\omicron}\ \text{Παύλ}\ \tau\tilde{\omicron}\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \delta\eta\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\cdot\tau\omega\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\kappa\eta\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\sigma\iota\gamma$, from hence is Arius confuted and put to shame, St. Paul proclaiming Christ to be God over all.

4. WE cannot but think it a good Argument, and a clear Proof of the Deity of Christ, that the Creation of the World is so often, and in the strongest Terms attributed to him. To avoid this, our Author wou'd have the (a) *Father consider'd as the primary Creator, and that the Son did create by a Power derived from his Father.* But he tells us not whether that derived Power be finite or infinite; whether an infinite Power can be derived and imparted, except the Divine Nature, to which it seems inseparably to belong, be communicated; or whether a finite and secondary Power can signify any thing in a proper Creation, which the Scripture represents as immediately performed by God himself, who commanded, and it was done. Besides there appears so much Absurdity in the Notion of an Instrument in Creation, as led some of old (we observed before) to the Grounds and extravagant Conceit, that God provided a Chaos of Matter for the Word to work upon, and frame the Beautiful and magnificent Fabrick of this World out of; but why should we affect to be wise above what is written? The Scripture plainly tells us, both, (b) *that God made all Things, and that (c) the Word was God, that all Things were made by him, and that without him was n t anything made that was made.* So that Arch Bp. Tillotson after Austin, concludes, if the Word was made, he made himself. (d) *By him all Things were created that are in Heaven and that are in Earth, visible and invisible,*

(a) Letter p. 26. (b) Rev. iv. 11. (c) John i. 1. 2. (d) Col i. 6.

whether they be Thrones or Dominions, or Principalities or Powers, all Things were created by him and for him. If it be said that [δὲ αὐτοῦ] implies his acting only by a delegated Power, 'tis known and can't be deny'd, that the same Expression is used with respect to the Supreme God, (a) Of whom and to whom are all Things. Does the Lord of Hosts challenge this as his peculiar Prerogative, (b) I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God; Of Christ also 'tis affirmed, that (c) he is the Beginning and the End, the first and the last (the first Cause and the last End). Is God said to (d) have made all Things for himself; 'tis also said of Christ Jesus, that as all Things were made by him, so all Things were made for him. And can we well imagine that the whole Creation shou'd be for a Creature, the Universe design'd for its Glory? Very remarkable 'tis, that the inspir'd Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, does Ch. i. 10. without Difficulty or Hesitation, without any Explication to limit or qualify the Sense, apply directly to him, what, Psal. cii. is confessedly address'd to the Supreme God. And thou Lord in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands; They shall perish, but thou remainest yet. He that was before the Mountains were brought forth, and before the Earth and the World were formed, must be allowed in the Prophet's Account, Psal. xc. 2. From Everlasting to Everlasting to be God. How do we come to be assur'd of the Existence of a God, who is the supreme Object of our Worship, but by the sensible Proof he has given of his Being and Perfections in the Works of Creation? (e) For the invisible Things of him from the Creation of the World are clearly seen, being understood by the Things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead. He was known to Israel of Old, and is distinguish'd as the proper Object of our Adoration by this Character, the Maker of Hea-

(a) Rom. xi. 36 (b) Isa. xlv. 6. (c) Rev. xxii. 13. (d) Prov. xvi. 4
(e) Rom. i. 20.

ven and Earth. *Isa. xlv. 24. I am the Lord that maketh all Things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by my self, Thus Hezekiah confesses, (a) Thou art the God, even thou alone, thou hast made Heaven and Earth. Thus Nehemiah ix. v. Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone, thou hast made the Heaven of Heavens with all their Host, the Earth and all Things that are therein, and the Host of Heaven worshippeth thee.*

5. THE next thing he considers as alleged in Proof of Christ's Divinity, is his Omniscience; an Argument not easily baffled by the subtle Attempts made in Order to it. It can scarce escape the Remark of a sober and considerate Christian, that *Solomon the Wisest of Men*, and under the Conduct of Inspiration, affirms in a most solemn Address to God, *1 Kings viii. 39. Thou, even thou, only knowest the Hearts of all the Children of Men*; and this the most high appropriates as his Prerogative. *Jer. xvii. 10. I the Lord search the Heart, I try the Reins, even to give every Man according to his Ways.* Now behold! Christ Jesus stands forth, and assumes without Scruple, and in the clearest Expressions, what the great God challenges so peculiarly to himself, *Rev. 2. 23. I am He that searcheth the Reins and Hearts, and I will give to every one of you according to your Works.* No wonder therefore that this is so often remark'd and acknowledg'd by the Disciples of Christ, *John ii. 24, 25. John xxi. 17.* And that in a very different Manner from what the Woman of *Jekoah's* Compliment to *David's* Prudence and Sagacity does impart, *2 Sam. xiv. 20.* which I know not with what Decency our Author could bring into Comparison therewith. Nor may we presently presume to rob him of this Glory upon the slight and precarious Suggestion, that such a Knowledge might possibly be imparted to him, as also to some other Prophets. But did ever any

(a) 2 Kings xix. 15.

Prophet challenge the Prerogative to himself, of knowing Hearts in the Expressions that are employ'd, on purpose to set forth the Omniscience of God?

THERE are however two Texts of Scripture offer'd in exception to this plain Argument. *John viii. 28. As my Father has taught me, I speak these Things.* And *Matt. xiii. 32. But of that Day and that Hour knoweth no one, no not the Angels that are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* Now who perceives not, that tho' Christ be One with the Father, and the Fulness of the Godhead dwell in him, yet he is also Man and Mediator, and that considering him as a Prophet, sent and commission'd to reveal the Will of God, he was to reveal only that which his Father taught him, and which he had in Commission to deliver and make known, and that as he was the Son of Man, under which Character he speaks here of himself, *v. 26. he knew no more than was communicated and imparted to him.*

Ἰνδὸς καὶ μὴ ὡς Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀνθρώπου. He knew, as God, but was ignorant as Man. Greg. Nazian.

As to his having a rational Soul, which our Author would here bring in doubt, it has been consider'd before. And methinks 'tis but little Evidence of the Goodness of the Cause these Gentlemen are engaged in, when for the Support of it, they are driven to deny even the true Humanity of Jesus Christ, and to call in Question his having a reasonable Soul. (a) (*Verily he took not on him the Nature of Angels, but he took on him the Seed of Abraham; wherefore in all Things it behoved him to be made like unto his Brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest* (b). So the one Mediator between God and Men is the Man Christ Jesus. (c) Now, says he, *is my Soul troubled*, when he was about to suffer; and as our blessed Lord very often assumes, and seems to delight in the Name of *the Son of Man*, which he cou'd not be, without a humane Soul: So (d) *God*

(a) *Heb. ii. 16, 17.* (b) *1 Tim. ii. 5.* (c) *John xii. 17.* (d) *Acts xvii. 31.*
has

has appointed a Day in which he will judge the World in righteousness by that Man whom he hath Ordained.) But such and worse Absurdities must be swallowed, in denying Things plainly revealed, under pretence of their being (in some respect) Unintelligible. Our Author urges that according to our Interpretation, (a) *Christ's answer to his Disciples was but a mere Evasion, and without doubt being inquisitive to know that time, they would be ready to say, Well, Lord, if thou dost not know it as thou art Man, yet tell us as God.* A fancy indeed! Unworthy of his Judgment and Sagacity! As if when they found that Christ had it not in his Power and Commission, as Son of Man, to reveal it, they should think themselves concern'd, further to importune him about it. Thus we see how far this is off being (b) *a Demonstration of the Mistake of our Opinion.*

6. I come now to consider what is of very great Weight and Importance in it self, and what every Christian is concerned in, and that is the Worship which is due, and to be paid to our Lord Jesus, God over all blessed for ever. When the Controversy is about the proper Object of Worship, in which every Christian has an Interest at Stake, we can't be blam'd if we are upon our guard, and be not presently by the sight of Men drawn to worship and serve a Creature besides the Creator; and if we have not the Presumption upon slight Pretences to condemn as Idolatrous, what is, and has been the common Practice of the Christian Church. That a Civil Respect and Worship is to be given in different degrees to Persons in Power, no Body denies; but from hence to argue or infer, that no proper divine Worship is due to the Lord that bought us, God, manifested in the Flesh; or to suppose that this may serve to answer, and invalidate the Pleas from Scripture and Reason, for the

(a) Letter p. 28. (b) *Ibid.* 27.

Sentiments and Practice of the Christian World, is what will not be easily admitted. Nor can it be allowed that Christ has a Right to our Worship upon no other *Ground* or (a) *Reason*, but the mere Gift and Command of the Father, which I take to be the Author's Meaning, and direct Answer to the Argument. We may here perceive what a Shift our Author is driven to in this Matter, when he betakes himself to *Bellarmino's* main Argument for the Worship of Angels, Saints, and Relicks, *Pf. xcix. 5.* And will needs have it that the Footstool is commanded to be worshipped, when not only *Piscator* and *Grotius*, but *Muis* also (a Popish Commentator) allows the Rendring it to the same Sense with our Translation, worship at his Foot-stool [*Deum apud Scabellum*], as agreeable to the Hebrew, and that this is the proper rendring of the Hebrew Phrase, and the Sense of the [ל] will appear to any that consider that the same Expression is used in *ver. 9.* of this very Psalm [וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִי לְהָר] and rendred by us, as also by the Septuagint, *worship at his holy Hill*, plainly expressed, *Psal. cxxxviii. 2.* *I will worship towards thy Holy Temple.* So *1 Kings viii. 44.* *Pray unto the Lord towards the City, and towards the House that I have built,* the true Reason of *Daniel's* opening his Windows towards Jerusalem, when he prayed, *Dan. vi. 10.*

To bring this Matter into a fuller Light it may be observ'd that our Author's Notion seems to state the Business of Religious Worship upon the Foot of a mere positive Command, so that the Pagans and Papists are Idolaters, only for want of God's Precept for their Worship; whereas the Scripture charges with Idolatry upon the account of *doing Service to them who by Nature were no Gods*; and for *worshipping and serving the Creature with, or beside the Creator*, [μαρτυροῦν τὸν κτίσταντα] *Rom. i. 25. Gal. iv. 8.* Nor can it be imagin'd that God should interpose to warrant any Wor-

(a) Letter p. 29.

ship by Precept, which the Light of Nature does condemn: Positive Commands are not wont to interfere with and cross moral Duties. The formal Object of religious Worship is still the same, and Reason, or natural Light, may be sufficient to direct to it, or at least determine what is not a fit and proper Object; but the Case is different with respect to the Means and Manner of Worship, where is Room and Occasion for the Direction of a particular Institution or Command. And thus as God has an unquestionable Right, it may be expedient for him to determine and appoint, how and in what Manner we may acceptably serve him; while yet we can't think our selves at Liberty to worship or serve another with, or besides him, without violating the Rights of our great Creator, and our Natural Obligations. Thus he does often appeal to (a) Reason, as sufficient to condemn the Idolatries in Practice; and (b) declare, that he will not give his Glory to another; and (c) that the Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth shall perish.

As for a subordinate and inferior Sort of religious Worship, to be paid to an inferior Sort of Deities, or subordinate Powers, I see no Foundation for it in Scripture; and 'tis manifest that under this Pretence Idolatry has been introduc'd and commonly practiced; that this hath been made to countenance the Superstition of Papists and Heathens, and proved the Occasion or Matter of the fatal Mistake in the World on this Subject. 'Twas such a kind of Worship which the Devil had the Impudence to ask of Christ, and which had been given him among the Nations, acknowledging that his Power and Dominion was but derived and subordinate, *Luke iv. 6. It is delivered unto me.* But Christ answers (not what some might have imagin'd; thou art an Apostate and unclean Spirit, and so unfit to be Worshipped;

(a) *Isa. xlv. 8.* (b) *Ibid. xlii. 8.* (c) *Jer. x. 11.*

or 'tis not due to thee, because my Father has not enjoined it, but. *ver. 8.*) *Get thee behind me, Satan, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve,* declaring, as in many other cases, not what is of positive and arbitrary Institution, but moral Duty and natural Right.

RELIGIOUS Worship may be taken to import a Subjection of Soul to the Being we address it, and is due only to God, who alone has a Right and immediate Access to it. And there are two special Branches of this Worship, or this is wont particularly to be given in solemn Acts of Adoration and direct Invocation; nor are these to be address'd to any other but him, whom we profess'dly devote our selves, and yield our Hearts to, and do believingly look for our Help and Salvation from. The Gospel, we confess, directs to the worshipping and address'ing the Father thro' *Jesus Christ*, by the Holy Spirit, and this common Method of Christian Worship is congruous and suited to the known Dispensation of Grace; but besides this, it does also lead to a direct worshipping of Jesus Christ as one with the Father, to a devoting our selves, and a submitting our Wills and Consciences to him, as our rightful Owner and sovereign Lord, as being our Creator and Redeemer, and our Saviour. In this Quality, not as an Agent or Embassador but as a Sovereign, he demands Obedience, and proclaims Peace and Pardon to rebellious Subjects, and while we profess'dly take him for our Saviour, we acknowledge him to be our Lord and our God. That we owe such a direct Worship and Homage to the blessed Jesus, and have clear and abundant Warrant for it, will appear, if we consider.

(1). In general we are directed to *honour the Son even as we honour the Father, and he that honoureth not thus the Son, honoureth not the Father which sent him, Jo. v. 23.* And shall we come off with the Pretence, that we honour him truly, tho' not with the same or like kind of

Honour with the Father? must we not truly, honour our Rulers, and which of them, nay which of the glorious Angels, has God at any time commanded, that we should honour even as we honour himself?

(2). As for prostrate Adoration, and solemn Ascription of Glory, the whole Church both in Heaven and Earth is represented as paying this Homage to him jointly with the Father. *I heard, says St. John, Rev. v. 11, 12, 13. The Voice of many Angels round about the Throne, &c. saying with a loud Voice; Worthy is the Lamb that was Slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing. And every Creature which is in Heaven and on Earth, &c. heard I, saying, Blessing, Honour, Glory, and Power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.*

(3). CHRIST Jesus is also to be worshipped by direct and solemn Invocation. 'Tis mentioned as the common Character and Practice of Christians, *1 Cor. i. 2. to call upon his Name.* And what is unquestionably spoken of God, *Joel. ii. 32. is without Hesitation apply'd to Christ, Rom. x. 13. Whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord, shall be saved.* Nor may we address our Prayers directly to any other but him, who is the Object of our Faith and Trust, *Rom. x. 14. If we are by him to believe in God, he does also, Jo. xiv. 1. require that we believe in him jointly with the Father, and demands a Trust and Confidence in himself, which are not due to a less Person, than to him, who is one with his Father.*

(4). HE is also the Proper or supreme Object of Religion, as that signifies a Devotedness to the Service and Glory of him whom we Worship. And as in the solemn Rite of Baptism, we profess to do this: so, *Rom. xiv. 7, 8, 9. None of us liveth unto himself, and no Man dyeth to himself; for whether we live, we live unto the Lord, or whether we dye, we dye unto the Lord; whether we live therefore or dye we are the Lord's.*

For

For this End Christ both died and rose, and lived again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.

THERE is doubtless a Difference to be made, between the formal reason of Divine Worship, which is infinite Perfection; and the special Motives and Considerations, that may induce and quicken to a particular giving of the Worship. Unto God absolutely consider'd is Adoration paid, upon the Manifestation of his glory in Creation, *Rev. iv. 11. Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive Glory and Honour and Power, for thou hast created all Things.* A grand Motive to the paying Adoration to Jesus Christ is Redemption, *Rev. v. 12. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive Honour, Glory and Blessing.* Upon this Motive we are to devote our selves to him, so as not to live to our selves, but to him who died for us and rose again. *2 Cor. v. 15.* But then he wou'd not be capable of this high Respect, he wou'd not have right to demand it, were he not one with the Father, and truly our God. Indeed when we consider, that it was He that made, and has redeemed us, that there is no other Name whereby we must be saved, that he is to be our Judge for Eternity; what Homage or Service can we think too much for him? No wonder that every Knee must bow to him, and every Tongue confess that he is Lord. True, but it will be said, unto the glory of God the Father, who has exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name; I grant it, but with this Consideration, that tho' he had an original Right to the Government of the World, and to be the Judge of it, as belonging to the Divine Nature; yet not to have the immediate and sole Exercise of this Power committed unto him, and put into his Hands, and that in our Nature, but by Consent and Agreement, or by a voluntary Dispensation, and by his Father's Gift and Appointment.

7. As for Baptism, the Nature and Design of it have been taken Notice of in the preceding Article,

and has been always I think reckon'd an important part of Christian Worship, wherein particular Homage is paid to Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as in the business of our Salvation acting under distinct Considerations, and condescending to assume distinct Offices. The distinct Form therefore of Administration has been always observed with great Care in the Church, as signifying the peculiar Faith of Christians, and a solemn Covenant Transaction between God and believing Penitents, wherein Father, Son and Spirit are consider'd, not simply as three Persons in the Godhead, but as related to Man for the Ends of the Covenant, undertaking each to perform his proper Part; And the Persons baptiz'd, recognizing their joint Interest in him, do professedly Dedicate and Devote themselves to Father, Son and Holy Ghost, expecting to be saved by the Father's Grace, thro' the Mediation of Jesus Christ, under the Conduct of the Holy Spirit; and as Circumcision of old, Baptism under the Gospel can be no less, than a Seal of the righteousness of Faith. Must we not therefore conclude, that Baptism, when so great a Weight is laid upon it, *Mar. xvi. 16.* is something more, than a mere *Form (a) of entering into the Christian Religion; whereof the Father is the Author, the Son the Publisher, and the Spirit the Confirmer?* Alas! that these Gentlemen, finding it necessary for the Interest and Support of their Opinion, should make so little Scruple of lowering and speaking so slightly of the solemn Institutions and more important concerns of Religion, that happen (or seem) to stand in the Way! Had this only been intended, how easy had it been for the Scripture, somewhere or other to have made this plain Expression of it, and obviated the common and dangerous Mistake of the Christian World, in so solemn an Ordinance, of constant Use and Practice, believing that the three

(a) Letter p. 30, 31.

into whose Name we are Baptiz'd, be that One God, to whose Faith and Service we are Vow'd and Consecrated? Nor in this View does there seem to be any great Occasion for the use of such a Form. (a) That *the Israelites were baptized unto Moses in the Cloud, the Apostle observes, 1 Cor. x. 2.* but how different a Thing is it to be so Baptized, as to pass under the Conduct of *Moses* thorough the Sea and the Wilderness, and to be Baptized into the Name of *Moses*, indifferently, and in Conjunction with the Name of God, and that in a sacred Institution, and special act of Devotion, to be practised in all Generations. Our Author is pleased further to compare this with what is said, *1 Tim. v. 21. [b] I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels;* but how odd must this seem to any considerate Person who perceives the Difference, between a Charge given before such Witnesses as might put some awe upon the Mind, and awaken Diligence, and a most solemn Act of Religion referr'd indifferently to Three, as the joint and proper Object of it, signify'd a professed Devotedness to each of them. Nor may the solemn Benediction (c) *2 Cor. xiii. 13.* be so slightly passed over, or well thought to import less than a Prayer to Jesus Christ together with the Father and the Holy Ghost, for their imparting special Grace severally in the distinct Relation they bear to Christians, which can't be ask'd or expected from any mere Creature.

8. THE last Argument our Author mentions, and that as *most plausible according to our Translation is taken from Phil. ii. 5, 6, 7. Let this Mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the Form of God, thought it no Robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no Reputation, &c.* I think it needless here to do any more, than consider what he offers to invalidate the Argument from this Text, in which

(a) Letter p. 32. (b) *Ibid.* (c) *Ibid.*

he seems willing particularly to triumph, but as far as appears upon slender Evidence. He first remarks after Dr. *Hammond*, that the [but] in the beginning of the 7th verse, seems not so well to agree with the Apostle's Meaning as exprest in our Translation, and this the Dr. thinks is the only Argument that makes it probable that the Phrase [*thought it no Robbery*] should be otherwise construed. However he judges that either the [ἀλλὰ] may be render'd [yet] (and thus it signifies in 1 Cor. viii. 6. and is so render'd by the Author himself, p. 11.) or if it be render'd [but] the Sense is, He was God, and without any injury equal to his Father, but for all this, or notwithstanding this, he vilify'd himself, &c. Which the Dr. takes to be the Clear rendring of the Place. But it is the Meaning of the Expression [ἐν ἀπαγμῶν ἡγνῆτι] that is especially contested. And here by the Way, (a) the Author does either misrepresent or mistake Dr. *Whitby*, in saying, that 'tis only to be met with in *Plutarch* and *Heliodorus*, in both which Writers it signifies to covet earnestly; Whereas the Dr's Words are, This Greek Phrase is only to be met with in *Plutarch*, says *Grotius*, tho' I can't find it there, and in *Heliodorus*, in which Writer, &c. meaning plainly the latter only. The truth is, that there is no great Reason to rely upon the Authority of this *Heliodorus* in the Matter. He flourish'd not till towards the End of the fourth Century, and in his Youth wrote a loose and lewd Romance; out of which this is taken: But then it is observable, that even the Phrase he makes use of is [ἀσπαγμα ποιῆν and ἐποίησαν] and once [ἐν ἀσπαγμα ἡγνῆτι] which every one that understands the Greek sees to be very different from the Apostle's Expression. Nor do [ἀσπαγμὸς and ἀσπαγμα] signify the same Thing, the former denoting [*Actum rapiendi*] the Act of Robbery, the latter [*prædam raptam*] the prey or purchase of Robbery, Now if the Apostle's Phrase had been

(a) Letter page 33.

[ἐκ δὲ μαγνὰν ὑψίστων] we might possibly have follow'd *Hellodorus*, and render'd it, *he took it not for a Prey, he did not cover and snatch at it, as a very desirable Thing;* but when 'tis [ἐκ δὲ μαγνὰν ὑψίστων] the direct and proper Meaning seems to be, *he did not esteem it an act of Robbery, or account it an Injury, [τὸ ἴσους ἰσὺν θεῷ] to be equal to God, or to be like the most High.* Considering also that the Apostle useth the Verb [ἵσους] several times in this same Epistle, in the same Sense we have given of it. And as *Dr. Hammond* and others justify our Translation herein, and Account it most Just and Natural; so *Dr. Edwards* thinks it in a manner past Dispute. And tho' some are content to admit the other Sense, as unwilling possibly to give themselves, or others too much trouble in a Matter of nicer Observation, or to avoid wrangling, yet secure of the Main and more important Thing in Controversy, they give such a just Interpretation, as no way interferes with, or injures our Lord's Claim to an Equality with his Father. Thus *A. bp. Tillotson*, (a) *That he was not only with God, before he assumed Humane Nature, but also was really God; St. Paul tells us: Let this Mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the Form of God, did not arrogate to himself to be equal with God, (taking this to be the Meaning of the Phrase as used by Plutarch): i. e. He did not appear in the Glory of his Divinity, which was hid under a Veil of human Flesh and Infirmary. So that if his being made in the Fashion of a Man does signify that he was really Man by his Incarnation; then surely his being in the Form of God, when he took upon him the Likeness of Man and the Form of a Servant, must in all reason signify, that he was really God before he became Man, for which Reason the Apostle did not doubt to say, that God was manifested in the Flesh.*

HAVING thus with all the Fairness I could, con-

(a) Works Fol. page 541.

sider'd what has been urg'd in answer to those Eight Arguments, which our Author saw fit to take Notice of, for the Deity of Christ. I proceed now to observe what he offers in opposition to it; the rather for that he appears very confident in his own Notion, but insinuates that we are far enough from having such clear and solid Proofs for our Opinion, which yet the Reader may make some Judgment of, by what has been already laid before him, and which he will do well impartially to consider.

(a) His first and principal Text is, 1. Cor. viii. 4, 5, 6. *We know that an Idol is nothing in the World, and that there is no other God but one. For tho' there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, as there be Gods many, and Lords many; yet to us there is but one God the Father of whom are all Things, and we in or for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all Things, and we by him.* If we observe the manifest Scope of the Apostle here, it will appear that there is but small Occasion for the Warmth and Transport our Author expresses in asking (b), *Can any Mortal give a Reason why, if he had been of the Mind of your severe Censurers, he should not have expressed himself thus; But to us there is but one God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost?* Methinks our Author without so much Emotion might have consider'd, that it was not the Apostle's Design here, nor did the Subject he was upon oblige him, to give an Account of the Mystery of the Trinity; nor was he under any Necessity of representing the Differences or distinct Relations conceivable in the Divine Nature; but the Thing which he does purposely assert, as best answering the End he had in view is, that there is but one God, in opposition to the Polytheism of the Gentiles, or the Opinion and Worship of many Gods, that was then so generally spread thro' the World. Had he been of the Mind of the Author, must he not have said, Whereas there are

(a) Letter p. 22.

(b) Ibid.

many that are called Gods and Lords, many had in Veneration among the deluded Heathen: To us Christians there are but two Gods, One supreme and unoriginated, the other subordinate and inferior; a Being of glorious Perfections, and a God also by Office and delegated Power? How much more natural and agreeable to his Purpose, and to the grand Design of the Gospel, which was to abolish the Idolatrous Worship of many Gods, to affirm, To us there is but One God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ, who is not another God, tho' in some Respect different from the Father; tho' he be Man, yet being inseparably and immediately united to the divine Nature, he is to be consider'd, not as excluded from Deity, but as one God with the Father, by whom all Things in the present State are manag'd and immediately administred? And the Apostle's saying, *To us there is but one God*, no more excludes Christ from being God with his Father, the God of Christians, than by adding, *There is but one Lord*, excludes the Father from being the Lord of Christians; [*Deut. vi. 4. the Lord our God is one Lord*] or any more than Gods saying, *Isa. xliii. 11. Besides me there is no Saviour*, excludes Christ from being the Saviour. Thus (a) Dr. Whitby produces plain this sages both from Origen and Novatian before the Arian Controversy, arguing in the same Manner from Pas-Text.

BESIDES the Works here attributed to the Father and Christ, argue them, tho' in some Sense distinct, to be the same God. The Dr. therefore adds. 1.) *Christ is here stiled that one Lord by whom are all things, i. e. by whom all things were created, which are in heaven, and which are in Earth. Eph. i. 9. Col. i. 16. and by the Work of Creation is the Godhead known. Rom. i. 20. and this is the very Description elsewhere made of God the Father, that it is he by whom are all Things, Rom. xi. 35.*

(a) *In loc*

Heb. ii. 10. 2). *All Things were created not only by this Lord, but [εἰς αὐτὸν] for him also, Col. i. 16. the very Thing the Apostle here ascribes to God the Father.* Moreover except we take him in this Sense, he seems to give Advantage for a just Reply to be made in excuse of the Heathen, who held one self-existent supreme God, but thought many other inferior Gods and Lords had a Right to a lower and subordinate Worship, as constituted and appointed by Him, in Power and Authority under him. At least to level his Discourse and Reasoning, against their Opinion and Practice, one might have expected, that he would rather have shewed them, or attempted to prove that the Gods many and Lords many, which they paid Service to, under the great God, were not indeed such as he had authoriz'd and appointed; but that Christ Jesus was the only inferior Deputy Lord, or God by Office, whom he commanded to be worship'd.

(a) As for his speaking of the Father in this Text in contradiction to Jesus Christ his Son, whom he styles the One Lord; besides what has been already observ'd, that he speaks not of him as another God tho' in some Respect differing from the Father; we may consider that he speaks of him under another Character, as in our Nature ordained a Mediator. Thus 1 Tim. ii. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus,* who having the Fulness of the Deity dwelling in him, is fitted as a Day's-Man that takes hold of both, to adjust the Difference between God and Men, and thus without Inconsistence or Absurdity, God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself. Thus also Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6. where our Author suggests, that (b) *Godhead is peculiarly attributed to the Father,* no more appears to be intended than that, whereas the Father is often represented as supporting the Majesty and Rights of the Deity; Christ Jesus, God manifested in Flesh, and so

(a) Letter p. 11. 12.

(b) *ibid.*

of a distinct Consideration from the Father, is one Mediator and one Lord, unto whom all Judgment is committed; and into whose Faith, as but one and the same Faith, all Christians are enter'd by one Baptism. What has been offer'd may be easily apply'd to *Jo. xvii. 3. This is life Eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* The Author's Argument from this Text is (a) *If the Father to whom Christ here speaks, be the only true God, how can Christ be the only true God also?* I answer because *Christ and the Father are one, Jo. x. 30.* Nor can these Words be reasonably supposed to excluded him from a true Divinity, who is in Scripture stiled [*ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός*] *the true God, 1 Jo. v. 20.* [See *Whitby in loc.*] True therefore is the Gloss of *Grotius* that he is stiled the only true God in exclusion of those, whom the false Persuasion of the Gentiles had introduced; not so as to exclude the other Persons. In this Sence the Word *only* is frequently apply'd to God in the old Testament, *Deut. xxxii. 12.* [*κύριον μόνον*] *the Lord only was their Guide, and there was no false Gods with them* [*θεοὶ ἀλλότριοι*]; and yet the *Angel*, in whom his Name was, went with them, and saved them, *Exod. xxiii. 21.* *Isa. lxiii. 9.* *I am the Lord and besides me there is no Saviour, Isa. xliii. 11.* Nor does [*μόνον*], *only* as used in the New Testament exclude all others, *Jo. viii. 9.* *Jesus was left alone, and the Woman in the midst* [*καταλείψον μόνον*]; also *1 Cor. ix. 6.* *or I only and Barnabas,* [*ἡ μόνον ἐγὼ καὶ Βαρνάβας*] I see therefore no Reason why (b) *Rom. xvi. 27.* *To God only wise;* and *Rev. xv. 4.* *Thou only art holy,* Christ should be thought to be excluded? (c) Nor is it so manifest that the Title [*παντοκράτωρ*] Almighty, which seems in this latter Place given him, is never attributed to the Son, when not only here, but *Rev. i. 8.* he seems plainly to be called the Almighty, both because it is Christ that is spoken of in the Context, and for that the other Part of the

(a) Letter p. 13. (b) *Ibid* p. 12. (c) *Ibid.*

Description there made of him, is unquestionably claim'd by him, *ver. xi. 18.* and *ch. xxii. 13.* mention'd as the distinguishing Character of the Lord of Hosts, *Isa. xiv. 6.* nor is it so plain that the (a) *Song of Moses and the Lamb* must import that *Moses and the Lamb sing it*, when we find that in the other Songs of this Book instead of the Lamb's singing, both Angels and Saints make him the Subject of their Songs, and address their Songs to him, and that jointly with the Father, *Rev. v. 9, 12, 13.* [I may add, that if in this, *John xvii. 3.* the Father be taken as spoken of, not strictly in a relative Sense, but essentially for the whole Godhead, as seems in many other Places to be, and as I confess I incline to understand it, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, to be directly spoken of the Messiah, the Man Christ in Union with the divine Nature, in which Capacity he makes this Prayer; the Sense will be very clear. This is the Way to eternal Life, that Men, forsaking all false Gods, acknowledge thee to be the only true God, and acknowledge me to be the true Messiah, the Redeemer and Saviour of lost Souls. And it is worthy of Remark, that to know Christ Jesus as sent of God, is made necessary to Salvation, as well as to know the Father; nor can God be savingly known but in Christ Jesus, whom whosoever hath seen, hath seen the Father also; and to whom like Honour and Worship is to be paid as is given to the Father.]

OUR Author having thus urg'd his Exceptions against the Deity of Christ, is yet loth to quit the Argument without taking Notice of those Passages of Scripture, wherein the Father is said to be greater than the Son. And that he is so in a true and proper Sense who doubts? Those who adhere to the common Faith do acknowledge that the Son of God consider'd relatively, is inferior and subordinate to the Father, when yet his essential Glory and Perfection is the same, and he can't be properly a lesser or inferior God. A Father is always consider'd in that Relation as above his Son, and yet his Son not inferior to him, in the Nature, Properties and Endowments of a Man, much less is a Son of one Kind and Nature, and a Father of another. Christ Jesus also as Man united to the Godhead, as well as wearing the Character of *Mediator*, or in that Quality and Conside-

ration, is less than the Father. No wonder therefore 'tis said, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 27, 28. *When he shall have deliver'd up the Kingdom to God even the Father, who has left and committed the Administration of it to Jesus Christ unto that Day, he shall himself also be subject unto him that put all Things under him, that God may be all in all; even to the Man Christ Jesus, and to all both Angels and Saints, brought to Perfection of Glory and Happiness in and by him.*

THERE are yet two things, the astonishing Love of God in Jesus Christ, and the Value of his Sacrifice; the Glory of which he might well foresee would be thought to be eclipsed; and which with others would be after all, apt to stick in the Minds of considerate and good Men, who are sensible of their Obligations to redeeming Grace, and build their Hope of Salvation upon an Atonement of infinite Worth. And how can they forbear being alarmed, and justly prejudiced against a Notion, which appears to them really to tend to lessen Men's Esteem of Christ Jesus and his Love, and their Sense of Obligation to him? Must they not be upon their Guard, when such an Attempt is made to darken the Glory of the Son of God, and sap the Foundation of their Comfort and Hope? Can they be easily brought to think the Condescension of a Being of great Excellency, and his Sufferings to be more considerable, and that even with respect to Propitiation and Atonement, than what they admire and are ravish'd with in the Blessed Jesus, whom they consider in the glorious Constitution of his Person as God-Man? What tho' the Deity be impassible, and suffer'd not real Pain or Alteration, when Christ bore our Sins in his Body on the Cross? His holy Soul felt the stinging and Bitterness of Death, was in greatest Agonies of Sorrow and Distress; and in the Opinion of such as suppose its Pre-existence in a State of highest Glory, underwent such like Changes as our Author imagines in the Being, he supposes to suffer in Flesh. But that which gave greatest Virtue and Price to his Obedience and Sufferings was the infinite Dignity of his Person, not the mere Pain which the Humane Nature felt. How astonishing is the Consideration that God was manifested in the Flesh; that tho' the Deity it self was not capable of Misery, yet the Lustre of its Glory was veil'd, and it was truly concerned and interested in the Sufferings of the Humane Nature, which

'twas

'twas the most amazing Condescension for it to assume. So God loved the World that he gave his only begotten Son! He spared not his own Son! This entertains the Wonder and Songs of Angels, and the Triumphs of Saints, and will do so to Eternity, while Devils and harden'd Unbelievers fret and gnash their Teeth.

WHAT our Author is pleas'd to subjoin about the Holy Ghost, has been provided against in the preceding Discourse; and tho' the Deity of Christ has been more particularly consider'd and defended, yet there want not sufficient Proofs or Inducements to believe the same of the Holy Ghost, who is joined together with the Father and Christ in the solemnity of Baptism, as to whom we are to devote ourselves, by whose Grace we are sanctify'd, and under whose Conduct we are to be brought to Salvation. (a) *Lying unto him is called lying unto God.* (b) *Know ye not that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* It is God only that has a Right to have a Temple consecrated to him, wherein he may especially have his Residence, display his Glory, and have Service and solemn Oblations presented to him. It is from (c) him Grace is desir'd and pray'd for, in Conjunction with the Father and Christ. (d) *And these three are One.* It was the (e) Lord *Jehovah* that spake by the Prophets of old; (f) but they were inspir'd and acted by the Holy Ghost who spake in them. Divine Perfections are acknowledg'd in him. (g) He is called the eternal Spirit; represented as every where present, (h) *Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?* And as intimately acquainted with all the Father's Counsels, (i) *For the Spirit searches all Things, yea the deep Things of God.* As the Spirit of Man knoweth the Things that are in him: so the Things of God knoweth none but the Spirit of God [*ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός*]; nor are the Works ascribed to him less than Divine, or the Effects and undoubted Products of Omnipotence, which speak him to be true God. It was the (k) Spirit of the Lord that moved upon the Waters (*Chaos*) in the Creation of the World; and that (l) garnished the Heavens; the same (m) Spirit that rais'd up Christ Jesus from the Dead; and that (n) wrought the

(a) *Act. v. 3, 4.* (b) *1 Cor. iii. 16. Hag. i. 9.* (c) *2 Cor. xiii. 14. Rev. i. 4, 5.* (d) *1 John v. 7.* (e) *Heb. i. 1. Num. xii. 6.* (f) *Heb. iii. 7. 2 Pet. i. 21.* (g) *Heb. ix. 14.* (h) *Psal. cxxxix. 7.* (i) *1 Cor. ii. 10.* (k) *Gen. i. 2.* (l) *Jab xxvi. 13.* (m) *Rom. viii. 11.* (n) *Ibid.*

surprizing Miracles that were done by him and his Apostles; that does inspire Christians with a New and Divine Life, so as when they are said to be born again, (o) of the Spirit they are affirmed (p) to be born of God; (q) support them against all the Powers of Hell, and (r) raise them up again at the last Day. Yea, such as are the manifested and uncontested Works of Omnipotence done by him, that even the *Socinians* who deny his being a Divine Person attribute these Works to Almighty Power, and would have us to believe, that it is the Power of God which goes under the Notion of the Holy Ghost. Yet 'tis as plain and certain that the Scripture still speaks of him as of a Person, (s) who worketh according to his own Will, and (t) distributeth to every Man his Gifts and Graces severally as he pleases: (u) He enter'd into the Prophet *Ezekiel* and spake with him. How remarkably does the Manner of Expression, *John* xvi. 13. and elsewhere denote and signify his being a Person, *when the Spirit of Truth is come*: [ἐκείνῳ τὸ πνεῦμα.] Now how can we, upon the Evidence of these and the like Texts and Considerations, deny that the Deity does also properly belong to the Holy Ghost? or forbear being touch'd and deeply concerned at the Contempt and open Affront offer'd him in the Notions by some entertain'd? Will the Appearance of some Difficulty presently justify or warrant an Attempt to wrest and baffle plain Revelation? How strangely do Men sometimes treat the most sacred Things, and what Methods do they try under Prejudice, Bigotted and Prepossession in favour of a darling Scheme?

BUT it is objected that (a) however plausible our Answers may seem to the Arguments for the Son's being inferior to the Father; yet those for the Inferiority of the Holy Ghost will not admit of any such Evasion, since he is neither Man nor Mediator. And why, if the Scripture mentions some Differences in the Divine Nature, and speaks of them as we use to do of Persons, may we not speak of them according to that Revelation, and suppose there is a certain order in their Subsistence and Operation, or a sort of Subordination which we call relative, when there is no proper Subordination in the Godhead, nor is one Person inferior to another in respect of Nature and Essence? (a)

(o) *John* iii. 5, 6. (p) *John* i. 13. (q) 1 *John* iv. 4. (r) *Rom.* vii. 11. (s) *Heb.* ii. 4. (t) 1 *Cor.* xii. 11. (u) *Ezek.* iii. 24. xi. 1, 2. (a) *Letter* p. 16. (b) *Ibid.*

BM CM

(48)

But do not both the *Father and Christ give and send the Holy Ghost, and must not a Person be supposed to have an Authority over one whom he sends?* And what Absurdity in supposing that this may be done even among Equals, by Consent and Agreement, without any antecedent proper Superiority? Indeed here lies one part of the Mytery of Grace in our Salvation, that the glorious Three do not only concur in the Design, and in Thoughts of mercy to apostate Men, but have condescended to assume distinct Offices, and to perform distinct Parts in order thereto. Now how easy is it to imagine that these Offices may be distinctly executed according to Agreement and voluntary Dispensation, tho' no superiour Authority be claimed or exercised? Thus as Christ Jesus voluntarily undertook the Work of our Redemption, and to glorify his Father herein; so the Holy Spirit has undertaken to glorify Christ, to take of the Things of Christ and shew unto us, &c.

THUS I have endeavour'd with Candor and Mildness to consider what has been propos'd both for and against the true and proper Deity of our Lord Jesus, to examine the Scripture, and fairly offer from thence what seems to me to be the true Meaning, in a Point of Doctrine, that is purely of Revelation, and that I take to be of very great Importance to Christians; nor have I knowingly passed over any thing in the Letter I have had under Consideration that I thought to be of Weight.

UPON the whole it may seem strange, not only to see great Confidence in such a Cause, but to find the Author at a loss, to excuse their Arrogance, who lay such a Stress upon a Matter, which appears to them to be of very great Moment, if not of the last Importance. However, upon a Review, he may possibly see Occasion for a little more Decency, with respect to the known and settled Belief of Christians, and have so much Charity left, as to allow that it has not been lightly taken up upon *obscure Hints*; but upon the most serious and mature Searching of the Scriptures, by such as professedly bottom their Faith and Hope upon them, and have apply'd themselves with humble Minds, thence to learn the Will of God and live in Conformity to it.

March 3. 1718-19.

16 MA 61
I am, Sir, your humble Servant.

F I N I S.